UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

DISTRICT OF NEVADA

Deshana Renee Barner,

Plaintiff

v.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

11

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

Centennial Hills Hospital, et al.,

Defendants

Case No: 2:24-cv-002309-JAD-NJK

Order Denying Motion to Transfer Case to State Court but Dismissing Case So Plaintiff Can Refile It in State Court

[ECF Nos. 2, 9]

Plaintiff Deshana Renee Barner filed this action against a local hospital and physician, apparently asserting a claim for negligent infliction of emotional distress related to allegedly erroneous medical records. Because she proceeds in forma pauperis, the magistrate judge 12 screened her complaint, found that Barner fails to allege a basis for federal jurisdiction, and dismissed the complaint with leave to amend.¹ Plaintiff has not yet filed an amended complaint, so there are currently no claims pending in this case. But she has filed a motion for change of 15 venue, asking this court to transfer this case to Nevada state court under 28 U.S.C. § 1404(a). In that motion she acknowledges that "[t]he U.S. District Court for the District of Nevada lacks jurisdiction over [her] case, as the claims are rooted in state law and do not raise a federal question"; nor is there diversity jurisdiction because the parties, she concedes, are not diverse.²

The change-of-venue statute that Barner cites permits federal courts to transfer cases only to other federal courts, not to a state court.³ When a plaintiff realizes that the case she filed in

¹ ECF No. 7.

² ECF No. 9.

³ See 28 U.S.C. § 1404; Pope v. Atl. Coast Line R.R. Co., 345 U.S. 379, 384 (1953) ("Section 1404(a), by its very terms, speaks to federal courts; it addresses itself only to that federal forum

13

14

15

16 17

18

19

20 21

22

federal court belongs instead in state court because she lacks a basis for federal jurisdiction, her remedy is not to seek a transfer, but to seek dismissal so she can refile it in the proper state 3 forum. So I liberally construe Barner's concession that this court lacks subject-matter jurisdiction over this matter as a request to dismiss her case so that she may file it in Nevada's 5 | Eighth Judicial District Court.

IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that Barner's request for a transfer of this case to state court [ECF No. 9] is DENIED. But because she concedes that this court lacks subject-matter 8 jurisdiction over this case, I construe that acknowledgement as a request to dismiss it so that she can refile it in state court. So this case is DISMISSED without prejudice to Barner's ability to refile it in Nevada state court. The Clerk of Court is directed to CLOSE THIS CASE, and the pending motion to toll the statute of limitations [ECF No. 2] is DENIED without prejudice as moot in light of the case closure.

> U.S. District Judge Jennif Dated: January 8, 2025

in which a lawsuit has been initiated; its function is to vest such a federal forum with the power to transfer a transitory cause of action to a more convenient federal court.").